



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

they knew very well what it was to have the Duke of Northumberland administer justice in one way and Lord Marmion administer justice in another way. What happened? There happened to be an institution called the Church of Christ, and that institution said, "You can go into the duke's court if you want to, or into the baron's court; but we have a cathedral here and a court, and if two of our priests quarrel, we administer justice between them by the law of the living God, and that works everywhere. You can come here if you want to." And the people found that justice administered by one law for all England was a good deal better than justice administered by twenty different barons and squires and knights of the shires, so that people began coming into the great church courts, not intended for jurisdiction over them, because justice was done in the church courts by the same law for Yorkshire as for Cornwall, and they meant to have justice administered by that law. And the greatest step in the history of England was when King Henry, catching that notion from the church, sent round and established one law for all England and one set of judges for England. So determined was he that they should be the same judges and the same law that, in all the inconvenience of that time, he made the judge who sat in Cornwall sit afterwards in Essex and then in Lincoln and then in Yorkshire; the whole system of circuits in England began when Henry determined that there should be one law, administered in one way, in the whole of England.

Europe and America are to-day a smaller region than England was then. Europe and America have now more to do with each other than Cornwall had to do with York or Northumberland. And what you and I are here to see established is one system of jurisdiction which shall cover all those regions occupied by the six great powers of Europe and America, to be called the International Court of the Nations. (Applause.)

I do not go much into the history of the thing. I have taken for one of the mottoes by which I direct my life the words of St. Paul, "Forgetting the things that are behind, and reaching forth to the things that are before."

ADDRESS OF BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen.—We are all agreed that the year past has been a very remarkable one. Victor Hugo once condensed into the simple phrase, "*L'Année terrible*," a whole period of French history. I know not what adjective to apply to the year which we have been going through. In some respects it has been a very abominable year, in other respects a very encouraging year.

No good cause is ever greater than when it is first apparently defeated. When a great movement first goes through a conflict which costs it something, it learns for the first time its real strength and what it must do to establish itself. Our Union cause never became really strong until it was defeated at Bull Run. After that fateful day, the country learned that it had serious business on hand and that it must take hold in earnest of what it had so far half played with. I suppose that everybody who has been in any way engaged in this work of arbitration, thinking about it, reading about it, speaking for it, has been more or less disgusted with the action of the Senate in refusing to ratify the arbitration treaty. Some people have hastily concluded from this action that

the movement is for the present all over. Quite the contrary; we have learned, for the first time in the history of the arbitration movement, that we have a serious undertaking on our hands, which is worthy of the very best efforts that we can put forth. We have learned, for the first time in the history of the movement, who many of its friends are; we have learned who are its opponents, and the grounds of their objection, and where to look for the causes of opposition. So, on the whole, I am inclined to think that the year has been the most encouraging one in the whole history of the arbitration movement since the time of the Jay treaty. The action of the Senate and the whole subject of the defeat of the treaty will perhaps be taken up in a later session of this Conference and thoroughly discussed; I shall not take them up at this time. I think, however, we may well consider whether this Conference and all other such conferences have not directed their efforts partially in the wrong direction. We have looked too much, perhaps, to the heads of the government, rather than to the cultivation of public sentiment among the people, and among the representatives of the people in both houses of Congress.

You will be interested in noticing for a moment the actual gain which our cause has made during the past year. There have been not less than a dozen cases of arbitration decided or pending or referred during the year. A case has been decided between Great Britain and Holland; the difficulty between Great Britain and Venezuela has been referred to arbitration; a dispute which arose between Great Britain and Brazil, about the Island of Trinidad, has been settled, through the good offices of Portugal. France and Brazil have recently agreed to submit to arbitration the question of their boundary dispute, involving a larger area, I believe, than the whole territory in dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela. Between the United States and Great Britain we have had a commission sitting at Victoria, British Columbia, which closed its investigations recently, considering the damages due to Canadian sealers under the Paris award. The Alaska boundary question has also been referred to arbitration. We have had recently referred to arbitration a case between the United States and Mexico; one between the Argentine Republic and Chili, and another between Great Britain and Colombia, referred in 1886, are now pending. And there are others.

It is well known also that we have never had in this country so pronounced a public sentiment in favor of this peaceful method of settling international disputes. When the Jay treaty was made, public sentiment was nearly all the other way, as Dr. Hale has told us. Mr. Jay forfeited for the time being his standing among the people of the country. It was as much as people could do to retain their respect for Washington and Hamilton, both of whom earnestly favored the treaty. Then public sentiment was practically all against the peace-seeking diplomacy of the time; but in the exciting period through which we have just been passing, public sentiment in all the great populous states, in nearly all the older states, in the states, almost without exception, where the great newspapers and the great religious weeklies are published, has been with the diplomacy which negotiated this treaty and signed it on the 11th of January. I hardly know of a respectable daily or weekly throughout the whole country that was not on the side of the treaty; that fact has tremendous significance in the history of our movement.

We have found ourselves in the anomalous position of having a great convention, agreed upon by the Secretary of State and the Ambassador from England,—a treaty which had been started by Secretary Gresham and has been supported by Secretary Sherman, a treaty recommended by the Queen of Great Britain and by two Presidents of the United States in succession, a treaty supported by the intelligent Christian sentiment of the whole country;—we find ourselves in the anomalous position of having a convention of that order, supported by that order of public sentiment and of statesmanship, defeated by a mere handful of men. While the defeat is something to deplore, the development of public sentiment, on which we must rely at last, which changes senates by changing senators, which will find its representation ultimately in Washington, has been such as to give us the greatest encouragement. I am quite of the opinion that much more than two-thirds of the public sentiment of this country to-day is with the purpose of this arbitration conference and the treaty which has been rejected.

To carry my thought a little further, we have never had a year when the great magazines with their ablest writers, and the great weeklies and dailies have shown such unanimity in the line of our work. It is perfectly safe to say that, this unanimity of sentiment in the press having come, we are not in danger of losing it again. And when we have another treaty, of whatever kind, coming before the Senate, we may expect the rallying to the support of that treaty of all this vast public sentiment, through the public press which has expressed itself so strongly this year.

When we go into Europe, we find the same thing in a different way. The public sentiment in favor of this arbitration treaty has been even greater and more harmonious in England than in this country. The treaty was really forced upon Lord Salisbury, as those of us who have been somewhat behind the scenes in that country know, by the demand of the people, the intelligent people, of Great Britain. I had sent to me from Liverpool a document to be forwarded to Washington, signed by the representatives of seven hundred Christian congregations in and about the city of Liverpool alone, all speaking with one voice upon this great subject. And that was representative of the feeling throughout the whole United Kingdom.

Let me call your attention, beyond this, to what has been taking place on the continent of Europe. Public opinion in favor of international justice or arbitration (for Arbitration is the watchword in that country) has made tremendous advances. The German peace societies and the Austrian peace societies discuss the question almost wholly from the standpoint of right and justice; they do not deal with it much on religious grounds. When we met here last year there were between forty and fifty such societies in Germany alone. More than a dozen new ones have been formed in the German cities during the year. These societies, uniting in their great central organization at Berlin, have carried through the German Parliament, for the first time, a resolution approving of the principle of arbitration in international disputes. Not only so, but the resolution invited the Chancellor of the Empire to consider the question of entering into negotiations with other nations of the world for permanent treaties of arbitration for the settlement of international disputes. Thus the German Parliament, the repre-

sentatives of the German people, for the first time in their history, have spoken out almost unanimously in favor of this great movement, and have taken two steps at a time. Earlier in the year, about November, the Austrian Parliament did the same thing, at the instigation of the Inter-Parliamentary Peace Union. A resolution was carried through that parliament, suggesting to Francis Joseph and his government the advisability of proceeding at once to enter into negotiations with other countries for the establishment of a permanent system of international justice. One of the most disappointing things in connection with the defeat of the arbitration treaty at Washington is, not so much the disastrous effect upon our own people or the people of England, or the retarding of Anglo-American arbitration, but the fact that it must check in some measure, for the time being, the whole movement going on all over the Old World.

It is well known to many gentlemen and ladies here that in the year 1883 the Swiss Federal Council sent to Washington a request that the two governments should enter into some permanent system of international justice. The matter had been allowed to rest; but on the strength of the hope that the Anglo-American treaty would be ratified the present Administration had already opened negotiations with the Swiss government following the suggestion of 1883. That is all headed off, and the German and Austrian governments are, for the time being, discouraged from proceeding to negotiations, because they will hold it to be useless to approach a Senate which has rejected a treaty with a country related to ours in race, in history, and in common aims. A movement which, within three or four years, might have included Austria, Italy, France, Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, Denmark and Scandinavia has been stopped apparently for the time being—let us hope only apparently. That is the very worst aspect of the defeat of the Anglo-American treaty. But our country has been misrepresented before the world. The cause has been wounded in the house of its friends. It will be at least some months, possibly some years, before we shall get over the misfortune. But the people of the Old World will find after a time that behind the Senate of the United States is a people, whose sentiments are such that they will not submit to having their highest hopes and best wishes thwarted for long.

Another thing has pleased me in the study of this question, and in watching the development of it. While, on the whole, I heartily approve of the remarks we have listened to about the pettiness of "diplomacy," the fact remains that American diplomacy has recently approached a position of moral straightforwardness—a position from which I think it will never recede—looking more to the settling of difficulties between the nations on the high ground of Christian principle than on that of national selfishness and petty bickering. Senator Hoar said the other day in Boston, in his great speech on the return of the Bradford manuscript, that our Ambassador to Great Britain during the past four years had been the ambassador of the good-will of the American people rather than of the diplomacy of the American government. That was a fine expression; but the diplomacy of our country has been really much better than the Senator's words would indicate. It has been up to the standard of the people, possibly much beyond it. Our last three Secretaries of State have all favored a permanent system of

justice between this country and Great Britain and all other nations for that matter. Our Ambassador in Great Britain has had the same feeling. It is an interesting thing in our history that the diplomacy of the country has always been, as regards international friendship, especially with Great Britain, much ahead of the people. It was ahead in John Jay's time. When John Adams went to the British court he said that nothing would please him better than to be instrumental in restoring friendly relations between the two countries. The diplomacy of this country was ahead of the sentiment of the people in the time of Hamilton Fish, who was the first to suggest the Geneva arbitration, though the public were clamoring for war. We all know that during the past year American diplomacy has been at least up to the people in the demand for this permanent system of arbitration with Great Britain. So far as the Ambassador at Washington is concerned, British diplomacy has been of the same kind. Anglo-American diplomacy has reached a point, has taken a stand in favor of a permanent system of international justice, which is one of the most hopeful things in our time. Having the diplomacy with us, and having the intelligent people with us, it will not be long until, as senators come and go, we shall have a Senate that will represent both the diplomacy and the public sentiment of the country. (Applause.)

This Conference has already passed some of the stages of discussion on the subject now before us. During the sessions this year I think we may very well take up, in the first place, the defeat of the arbitration treaty, its causes and results; then the present status of the arbitration movement in its wider aspects as touching all the civilized nations; then the next measures to be adopted for the further promotion of the subject. We may wisely I think, devote one session of the Conference to the educational aspects of the subject.

Before I sit down, let me say that it is possible that we shall have to advise a treaty of a somewhat wider scope than the one which we have heretofore recommended. Many of us had hoped that the sentiment in England and America was such, and that past causes of prejudice and animosity had so ceased to operate, that when a treaty was once negotiated it would readily be ratified and become at once a part of the international law of the two countries. We have been disappointed; we have found lingering in our country and unduly represented at Washington a deep-seated prejudice out of which all the mischief has been hatched. It is possible that we may find it wise, after discussion, to recommend a treaty of wider scope. There is a class of people in this country still who will not swallow Great Britain; we shall possibly have to sugar-coat her a little for them by bringing in France, Switzerland and other countries whose parliaments have already spoken in favor of our movement. If we can succeed in agreeing to recommend a treaty of this kind, if we can get other nations into it besides Great Britain, I do not believe that any Senate two years hence would dare to refuse to ratify such a treaty. So I think the Conference may wisely discuss the question whether it will not at this time recommend a treaty of that character.

Alluding to the encouraging things of the year, I wish to say as I close that there is a congress sitting in Washington now which is the most unique, interesting and important conference in the history of the world. I refer to the International Postal Congress. When that Union

assembled in Washington, there were only three organized governments on the face of the globe out of it. Two of these have already joined; the last, China, has very likely this day entered the Union. If that be true, we have now, while this Conference is holding, the first complete international union in the history of the world, established for the promotion of a great international interest. This union is of momentous significance, because, so far as it goes, it establishes the peace of the world. The Postal Union will maintain itself hereafter in the face of all wars and rumors of wars. It may be locally disturbed, there may be hindrances to the transmission of the mails; but we have now the unique fact in history of a great union, representing all organized governments established for the perpetual promotion of an interest common to them all. That is certainly the beginning of "perpetual peace."

Everything is encouraging, everything hopeful, and I trust the Conference may set its face toward the future with greater courage and resolution than ever before.

ADDRESS OF REV. W. H. P. FAUNCE.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen.—The moral intensity of this Conference, and the limitation of time, preclude compliments, and almost force us to "salute no man by the way." Yet I cannot altogether refrain from expressing my admiration, even if it seem a little presumptuous, for our presiding officer, who during these two days has listened to an almost continuous fusillade against the honorable body of which he is one of the most honored members, and has listened with an unfailing courtesy, and unruffled urbanity, and the charity that "suffers long and is kind." The only thing that I will add about the Senate is to recall the remark of Thomas Jefferson. When asked, "What do you want of a Senate, anyway?" he said, "What do you want of a saucer with a teacup? You want it to cool your tea before you drink it." I will simply add that our national cooler has so thoroughly performed its function that there is some danger lest our national tea should be frozen before we drink it. (Laughter and applause.)

I cannot speak to represent the jurists or the lawyers to-day, but only to represent the great body of the common people who, however dimly, want to know what is true and to do what is right. For after the jurists have spoken, after the politicians have performed their manœuvres, after the jingoes have discharged their pulmonary patriotism, after the new journalism has raved and frothed and the powers that be have displayed masterly inactivity, then a question of public policy comes before a larger jury still and a vaster constituency yet;—the great body of sober-minded American people, who are not busy with their own horoscopes, but who are toiling and hoping and praying for the spread of universal truth, for the prevalence of universal righteousness, and the reign of universal peace.

Professor Bracq has well said that the war of 1870 settled nothing. We rejoice to hear of the pacific disposition of the leaders of the French nation. And yet it is but a little time since, in the Place de la Concorde, I looked across at the monument of Strasburg draped in black and crowned with wreaths of mourning, and saw Frenchmen clenching their hands with a dangerous look in their eyes. A little later I was in the city of Geneva,